

Case 1:14-cv-00193-HSM-CHS Document 19 Filed 08/25/15 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 580

Notably, this Court cannot substitute its own judgment for that of the Commissioner simply because substantial evidence may exist to support a different conclusion. *Felisky v. Bowen*, 35 F.3d 1027, 1035 (6th Cir. 1994) (“The substantial evidence standard presupposes that there is a zone of choice within which the Secretary may proceed without interference from the courts.”) (internal quotation marks omitted). Because the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Carter that the ALJ’s conclusions were supported by substantial evidence, the Court will **OVERRULE** Plaintiff’s objections (Doc. 18).

Accordingly:

- The Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Carter’s findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations (Doc. 17) pursuant to § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b);
- Plaintiff’s Objections (Doc. 18) are **OVERRULED**;
- Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 12) is **DENIED**;
- Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 15) is **GRANTED**;
- The decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**;
- This case is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**SO ORDERED** this 25th day of August, 2015.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE